Quantum private comparison protocol without a third party

Guang Ping He*
School of Physics, Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou 510275, China

To evade the well-known impossibility of unconditionally secure quantum two-party computations, previous quantum private comparison protocols have to adopt a third party. Here we study how far we can go with two parties only. We propose a very feasible and efficient protocol. Intriguingly, although the average amount of information leaked cannot be made arbitrarily small, we find that it never exceeds 14 bits for any length of the bit-string being compared.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Dd, 03.65.Ud, 03.67.Mn, 03.67.Ac, 03.65.Ta

arXiv:1604.06834v1 [quant-ph] 22 Apr 2016

I. INTRODUCTION

Private comparison, a.k.a. the socialist millionaire problem [1], is a two-party cryptographic task in which two millionaires Alice and Bob want to determine if their wealth a and b are equal, without revealing their actual wealth. It is analogous to a more general problem whose goal is to compare two numbers a and b, without revealing any extra information on their values other than what can be inferred from the comparison result. As a typical example of secure multi-party computations, this problem plays an essential role in cryptography. It has many applications in e-commerce and data mining where people need to compare numbers which are confidential.

Nevertheless, it is well-known that unconditionally secure quantum two-party secure computations are impossible [2–7], i.e., the dishonest party can always obtain a non-trivial amount of information on the secret data of the other party. Quantum private comparison (QPC) is also covered. To circumvent the problem, almost all existing QPC protocols ([8–25] and the references therein) added a third party to help Alice and Bob accomplish the comparison. The only exception is Ref. [26], in which such a third party is absent. But it was later found to be insecure [25, 27] because the secret data of the honest party will always be exposed completely to the other party.

While quantum cryptography has displayed promising power in many fields such as quantum key distribution [28], it is depressing if it cannot give a good solution to this simple problem. Also, involving a third party is undoubtfully less convenient for the practical applications of QPC. Thus it brings us to the question "what can we achieve for QPC when it is limited to two parties only?" Here we will propose such a protocol, in which only a very small amount of information on the secret data being compared will be leaked to the dishonest party. Therefore, despite that it is not unconditionally secure, it reaches a very useful security level and the elimination of the third party highly enhances the convenience of QPC. As there was very little progress made during the last decade in the realm ruled out by the existing impossibility proofs [2–7], we can expect our protocol to play more important roles in the practical applications of multi-party secure computations.

*Electronic address: hegp@mail.sysu.edu.cn

II. OUR PROTOCOL

Let $H(x)$ be a classical hash function which is a 1-to-1 mapping between the n-bit strings x and $y = H(x)$ (i.e., $H : \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}^n$). Denote the two orthogonal states of a qubit as $|0\rangle_0$ and $|1\rangle_0$, respectively, and define $|0\rangle_1 \equiv (|0\rangle_0 + |1\rangle_0)/\sqrt{2}$, $|1\rangle_1 \equiv (|0\rangle_0 - |1\rangle_0)/\sqrt{2}$. That is, the subscript $\sigma = 0, 1$ in $|\gamma\rangle_\sigma$ stands for two incommutable measurement bases, while $\gamma = 0, 1$ distinguishes the two states in the same basis. We propose the following protocol.

The QPC Protocol (for comparing Alice's n-bit string $a \equiv a_1 a_2 ... a_n$ and Bob's n-bit string $b \equiv b_1 b_2 ... b_n$):

(1) Using the hash function $H(x)$, Alice calculates the n-bit string $h^A \equiv h_1^A h_2^A ... h_n^A = H(a)$, and Bob calculates the n-bit string $h^B \equiv h_1^B h_2^B ... h_n^B = H(b)$.

(2) From $i = 1$ to n, Alice and Bob compare h^A and h^B bit-by-bit as follows.

If i is odd, then:

(2.1A) Alice randomly picks a bit $\gamma_i^A \in \{0,1\}$ and sends Bob a qubit in the state $\left|\gamma_i^A\right\rangle_{h_i^A}$.

(2.2A) Bob measures it in the h_i^B basis and obtains the result $\left|\gamma_i^B\right\rangle_{h_i^B}$. He announces γ_i^B while keeping h_i^B secret.

(2.3A) Alice announces γ_i^A.

If i is even, then:

(2.1B) Bob randomly picks a bit $\gamma_i^B \in \{0,1\}$ and sends Alice a qubit in the state $\left|\gamma_i^B\right\rangle_{h_i^B}$.

(2.2B) Alice measures it in the h_i^A basis and obtains the result $\left|\gamma_i^A\right\rangle_{h_i^A}$. She announces γ_i^A while keeping h_i^A secret.

(2.3B) Bob announces γ_i^B.

(2.4) If $\gamma_i^A \neq \gamma_i^B$, then they conclude that $a \neq b$, and abort the protocol immediately without comparing the rest bits of h^A and h^B. Otherwise they continue with the next i.

(3) If Alice and Bob find $\gamma_i^A = \gamma_i^B$ for all $i = 1, ..., n$ then they conclude that $a = b$.

III. CORRECTNESS

In step (2) of the protocol, when $|\gamma_i\rangle_{h_i}$ is measured in the basis h_i, the results will always be γ_i. But if it is measured in a different basis $\bar{h}_i$, both the results γ_i and $\bar{\gamma}_i$ can occur with the equal probabilities 1/2. Therefore, when Alice and Bob input the same secret data $a = b$, there will be $h_i^A = h_i^B$ and thus $\gamma_i^A = \gamma_i^B$ for all $i = 1, ..., n$, so that the protocol will always output the correct comparison result. On the other hand, if $a \neq b$, the hash values $H(a)$ and $H(b)$ will be different too. As $H(a)$ and $H(b)$ distribute randomly in $\{0,1\}^n$, the case that they have j ($j \in [1, n]$) different bits will occur with probability

$$p_j = \left(\begin{array}{c} n \\ j \end{array} \right) / (2^n - 1). \quad (1)$$

Consequently, in each of the corresponding j rounds of step (2), the qubit will be prepared in the state $|\gamma_i\rangle_{h_i}$ while being measured in the basis $\bar{h}_i$, and has probability 1/2 to give the result $\bar{\gamma}_i$, causing the protocol to abort and output the correct comparison result $a \neq b$. The only exception is that all these j qubits still give the result γ_i though measured in the basis $\bar{h}_i$. In this case the protocol will incorrectly output the result $a = b$ while they are actually inequal. This will occur with probability $(1/2)^j$. Summing over all possible j values, the total probability for getting an incorrect comparison result is

$$\begin{aligned} p_{inc} &= \sum_{j=1}^{n} p_j \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^j \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left(\begin{array}{c} n \\ j \end{array} \right) \frac{1}{(2^n - 1)2^j}. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Therefore, our protocol is not an ideal one. Fortunately, in practical applications n is generally very high, so that p_{inc} will be very close to 0. For example, when comparing two 32-bit strings (i.e., $n = 32$), the above equation shows that the incorrect comparison result occurs with probability $p_{inc} \simeq 0.01\%$ only.

Also, if the protocol finally outputs $a = b$ in step (3) but Alice and Bob want to further verify this result, they can replace a and b with $a \oplus s$ and $b \oplus s$, respectively, and run the entire protocol all over again from step (1). Here s is a random n-bit string chosen by either party and announced to the other party. Then whether a indeed equals b will be judged more precisely so that the probability p_{inc} for finally getting a wrong comparison result will be further reduced. But it is obvious that the price is that more information on the secret data a and b will be leaked as they are reused in the protocol for many times. For simplicity, in the following we merely study the amount of information leaked when the protocol is run only once.

IV. SECURITY

There is surely no security problem to consider when $a = b$, because both parties naturally know the secret data of each other from the comparison result. Now let us study how much information is leaked when the protocol outputs $a \neq b$.

An important feature of our protocol is that, if it aborts after running m ($1 \leq m \leq n$) rounds of step (2), the last $n - m$ bits of h^A and h^B will not be compared any more. They will not be encoded with qubits and transferred in the protocol at all. Thus it is obvious that these bits remain completely secret to the other party. As a consequence, the amount of mutual information leaked to each party is m bits at the most.

To increase m, a dishonest party surely wants to make the protocol abort as late as possible. Therefore, if Alice (Bob) cheats, in each of the odd (even) rounds of step (2.3) she (he) will always announce $\gamma_i^A = \gamma_i^B$ even if the actual result is $\gamma_i^A \neq \gamma_i^B$, so that the protocol will never abort in these rounds. In each of the rest $k \equiv m/2$ even rounds (for dishonest Alice) or $k \equiv (m+1)/2$ odd rounds (for dishonest Bob) among the first m rounds of step (2), the cheater has to announce γ_i in step (2.2) before the other party does so in step (2.3). Since he wishes to announce a value that satisfies $\gamma_i^A = \gamma_i^B$ so that the protocol will not abort, he needs to guess the γ_i value of the qubit state $|\gamma_i\rangle_{h_i}$ that the other party sent him in step (2.1). That is, he needs to distinguish between the density matrices $\rho_{\gamma_i=0} \equiv (|0\rangle_{h_i=0}\langle 0| + |0\rangle_{h_i=1}\langle 0|)/2$ and $\rho_{\gamma_i=1} \equiv (|1\rangle_{h_i=0}\langle 1| + |1\rangle_{h_i=1}\langle 1|)/2$. Calculations show that the maximal probability for distinguishing these two density matrices is

$$p_{\max} = \cos^2(\pi/8) \simeq 0.8536. \quad (3)$$

Therefore, the dishonest party can force each of these k rounds to continue with probability $p_{\max}$ at the most. Consequently, the probability for the protocol to abort at the mth round (i.e., it happens to continue for the first $k-1$ even (odd) rounds while aborts at the k-th even (odd) round when Alice (Bob) cheats) is

$$p_{abort}^m = p_{\max}^{k-1}(1 - p_{\max}) = \cos^{2(k-1)}(\pi/8)\sin^2(\pi/8). \quad (4)$$

That is, with probability p_{abort}^m the protocol will abort at the mth round, and the dishonest party will know nothing about the rest $n-m$ bits of the other's hash value, so that he learns m bits of information at the most. Summing over all possible m values and recall that $m = 2k$ ($m = 2k-1$) for dishonest Alice (Bob), the upper bound of the average amount of mutual information leaked is

$$\begin{aligned} I_A &= \sum_{k=1}^{[n/2]} m \times p_{abort}^m \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{[n/2]} 2k \cos^{2(k-1)}(\pi/8)\sin^2(\pi/8) \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$



FIG. 1: The average amount of information leaked I_A (I_B) for dishonest Alice (Bob) as a function of the length n of the bit-strings that they compare.

for dishonest Alice, or

$$I_B = \sum_{k=1}^{[(n+1)/2]} m \times p_{abort}^{m} = \sum_{k=1}^{[(n+1)/2]} (2k-1)\cos^{2(k-1)}(\pi/8)\sin^2(\pi/8) \quad (6)$$

for dishonest Bob. Here $[x]$ means the integer part of x. The above I_A and I_B are different because our protocol is asymmetric. In the $i = 1$ round of step (2) Alice prepares the qubit, and she does not announces γ_i^A until Bob announces γ_i^B. Thus dishonest Alice can always ensure that the protocol will continue at least to the second round. But dishonest Bob cannot completely avoid the protocol abort in the first round, making him obtain less information than dishonest Alice.

In Fig. 1 we show I_A and I_B as a function of the length n of the bit-strings a and b being compared. Intriguingly, the result reveals that the average amount of mutual information leaked never excesses 14 bits (for dishonest Alice) or 13 bits (for dishonest Bob) for any length n of a and b. This is because when $a \neq b$, the protocol stands a very high probability to abort after merely a few rounds of step (2). Thus the rest bits of h^A and h^B will remain secret to the other party as their information are never announced in the protocol.

Also, I_A and I_B are merely loose upper bounds, because in the above calculations we assumed that when the protocol aborts at the mth round of step (2), the cheater obtains m bits of information. But actually this will not occur with probability 1. For example, the optimal operation that can distinguish the density matrices $\rho_{\gamma_i=0}$ and $\rho_{\gamma_i=1}$ with probability $p_{\max} = \cos^2(\pi/8)$ is in fact the measurement that projects the state $|\gamma_i\rangle_{h_i}$ in the basis $\{\cos(\pi/8)|0\rangle_0 + \sin(\pi/8)|1\rangle_0, \cos(5\pi/8)|0\rangle_0 + \sin(5\pi/8)|1\rangle_0\}$. But this operation provides absolutely zero knowledge on the value of h_i. Other operations (such as the honest operation in the protocol) can learn h_i with a higher probability, but result in a lower probability for distinguishing $\rho_{\gamma_i=0}$ and $\rho_{\gamma_i=1}$. While the number of cheating strategies could be numerous, there is no doubt that its probability for learning h_i in each round can never exceed 1, and it can distinguish $\rho_{\gamma_i=0}$ and $\rho_{\gamma_i=1}$ (and thus avoid the protocol from aborting) with a probability no greater than $p_{\max}$. Therefore, as our above analysis assumes that the dishonest party can distinguish $\rho_{\gamma_i=0}$ and $\rho_{\gamma_i=1}$ with the probability $p_{\max}$ exactly while always know h_i with certainty, the bounds I_A and I_B are sufficiently general to cover any kind of cheating strategies.

Moreover, note that the information leaked is not the direct information on the strings a and b being compared, but the information on their hash values instead. Thus it is less useful for the cheater in practice. For example, even if dishonest Alice knows the exact values of the first I_A bits of Bob's h^B, it does not mean that she knows the first I_A bits of Bob's b. There are still 2^{n-I_A} bits of h^B remain unknown, meaning that there are 2^{n-I_A} possible choices for b. Consequently, in general Alice can hardly even know whether there is $a > b$ or $a < b$, needless to say other subtle properties of b, such as parity, weigh, etc.

V. COMPARISON WITH EXISTING QPC PROTOCOLS

As pinpointed out in Section 4 of Ref. [21] and also in Ref. [22], many previous QPC protocols with a third party also have a non-trivial amount of information leaked to at least one of the parties. Most of them are also less feasible as they require the use of entanglement, joint measurements, and quantum memory. On the contrary, our protocol can easily be implemented without these resources. For example, we can use 0°, 90°, 45°, 135° polarized photons as the carrier of the qubit states $|0\rangle_0$, $|1\rangle_0$, $|0\rangle_1$, $|1\rangle_1$ in the protocol, respectively. The receiver can measure them immediately, without the need to store them. Also, in step (2) Alice and Bob send a single qubit in each round. Once the protocol aborts, they no longer need to send qubits to compare the rest bits of h^A and h^B. The fact that the average amount of information leaked is below 14 bits indicates that the protocol averagely takes only 14 rounds to abort. That is, when $a \neq b$, in average our protocol merely takes 14 qubits to complete the comparison, thus it is extremely efficient. More importantly, all these are accomplished without the need for the third party.

Acknowledgements

The work was supported in part by the National Science Foundation of China.

[1] M. Jakobsson and M. Yung, in *Advances in Cryptology: CRYPTO '96, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 1109* (Springer-Verlag, 1996)**,** p. 186. Proving without knowing: On oblivious, agnostic and blindfolded provers

[2] H. -K. Lo, *Phys. Rev. A* **56,** 1154 (1997). Insecurity of quantum secure computations

[3] T. Rudolph, *quant-ph/0202143*. The laws of physics and cryptographic security

[4] R. Colbeck, *Phys. Rev. A* **76,** 062308 (2007). Impossibility of secure two-party classical computation

[5] L. Salvail, C. Schaffner, and M. Sotakova, in *ASIACRYPT 2009, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 5912* (Springer-Verlag, 2009)**,** p. 70. On the power of two-party quantum cryptography

[6] L. Salvail and M. Sotakova, *arXiv:0906.1671*. Two-party quantum protocols do not compose securely against honest-but-curious adversaries

[7] A. Chailloux, I. Kerenidis, and J. Sikora, *arXiv:1007.1875*. Lower bounds for quantum oblivious transfer

[8] Y. -G. Yang and Q. -Y. Wen, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **42**, 055305 (2009). An efficient two-party quantum private comparison protocol with decoy photons and two-photon entanglement

[9] Y. -G. Yang and Q. -Y. Wen, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **43**, 209801 (2010). Corrigendum: An efficient two-party quantum private comparison protocol with decoy photons and two-photon entanglement

[10] Z. W. Sun and D. Y. Long, *arXiv:1204.4587*. Cryptanalysis of the efficient two-party quantum private comparison protocol with decoy photons and two-photon entanglement

[11] Y. -G. Yang, W. -F. Cao, and Q. -Y. Wen, *Phys. Scr.* **80**, 065002 (2009). Secure quantum private comparison

[12] X. -B. Chen, G. Xu, X. -X. Niu, Q. -Y. Wen, and Y. -X. Yang, *Opt. Commun.* **283**, 1561 (2010). An efficient protocol for the private comparison of equal information based on the triplet entangled state and single-particle measurement

[13] J. Lin, H. -Y. Tseng, and T. Hwang, *Opt. Commun.* **284**, 2412 (2011). Intercept-resend attacks on Chen et al.'s quantum private comparison protocol and the improvements

[14] H. -Y. Tseng, J. Lin, and T. Hwang, *Quantum Inf. Process.* **11**, 373 (2012). New quantum private comparison protocol using EPR pairs

[15] Y. -G. Yang, J. Xia, X. Jia, and H. Zhang, *Quantum Inf. Process.* **12**, 877 (2013). Comment on quantum private comparison protocols with a semi-honest third party

[16] W. Liu, Y. -B. Wang, and Z. -T. Jiang, *Opt. Commun.* **284**, 3160 (2011). An efficient protocol for the quantum private comparison of equality with W state

[17] W. Liu, Y. -B. Wang, Z. -T. Jiang, and Y. -Z. Cao, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **51**, 69 (2012). A protocol for the quantum private comparison of equality with χ-type state

[18] W. Liu, Y. -B. Wang, Z. -T. Jiang, Y. -Z. Cao, and W. Cui, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **51**, 1953 (2012). New quantum private comparison protocol using χ-type state

[19] Y. -G. Yang, J. Xia, X. Jia, L. Shi, and H. Zhang, *Int. J. Quantum Inf.* **10**, 1250065 (2012). New quantum private comparison protocol without entanglement

[20] B. Liu, F. Gao, H. -Y. Jia, W. Huang, W. -W. Zhang, and Q. -Y. Wen, *Quantum Inf. Process.* **12**, 887 (2013). Efficient quantum private comparison employing single photons and collective detection

[21] G. P. He, *Int. J. Quantum Inf.* **11**, 1350025 (2013). Simple quantum protocols for the millionaire problem with a semi-honest third party

[22] Y. B. Li, Q. Y. Wen, F. Gao, H. Y. Jia, and Y. Sun, *Eur. Phys. J. D* **66**, 110 (2012). Information leak in Liu et al.'s quantum private comparison and a new protocol

[23] W. J. Liu, C. Liu, H. B. Wang, and T. T. Jia, *IETE Tech. Rev.* **30**, 439 (2013). Quantum private comparison: A review

[24] V. Siddhu and Arvind, *Quantum Inf. Process.* **14**, 3005 (2015). Quantum private comparison over noisy channels

[25] B. Zhang , X. T. Liu, J. Wang, and C. J. Tang, *Quantum Inf. Process.* **14**, 4593 (2015). Cryptanalysis and improvement of quantum private comparison of equality protocol without a third party

[26] J. Lin, C. -W. Yang, T. Hwang, *Quantum Inf. Process.* **13**, 239 (2014). Quantum private comparison of equality protocol without a third party

[27] G. P. He, *Quantum Inf. Process.* **14**, 2301 (2015). Comment on "Quantum private comparison of equality protocol without a third party"

[28] C. H. Bennett and G. Brassard, in *Proc. IEEE International Conference on Computers, Systems, and Signal Processing* (IEEE, New York, 1984), p. 175. Quantum cryptography: public key distribution and coin tossing